REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of this application is requested. Claims 1-23 are now pending with claims 1, 9, and 12 being independent. Claim1, 9, 12, and 19-20 have been amended. New claims 21-23 have been added.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephone interview of August 26, 2004 in which the Examiner suggested aspects of the specification that may be included into the claims in order to further prosecution. Applicant has amended claims 1, 9, and 12 and added new claims 21-23 to include the portions of the specification discussed in the interview.

Amended claim 1 describes an authorization control circuit in an electronic device that includes a digital signal processor to provide digital data output, determine an authorization state, and generate a disable signal. The circuit also includes a digital to analog converter coupled to the digital signal processor that receives the digital data output, converts the digital data to corresponding analog data, output the corresponding analog data, and mute the output of the corresponding analog data. The converter includes an input to receive the disable signal, the converter muting the output of the corresponding analog data in response to the disable signal. The disable signal is generated when the electronic device satisfies one or more sleep conditions.

Amended claim 9 describes an authorization control circuit in an electronic device that includes a digital signal processor to provide digital data output, determine an authorization state, and generate a disable signal. The authorization control circuit also includes a digital to analog converter coupled to the digital signal processor to receive the digital data output, convert the digital data to corresponding analog data, and output the corresponding analog data. The control circuit includes an analog amplifier to receive the analog output from the converter and generate amplified output. The analog amplifier has an input to receive the disable signal, the amplifier muting the amplified output in response to the disable signal. The disable signal is generated when the electronic device satisfies one or more sleep conditions.

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Deluca et al. (5,612,682) in view of Seo et al. (5,063, 597) and further in view of Nagata (6,114,981). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections for at least the reason that Deluca, Seo, and Nagata do not describe or suggest that the disable signal is generated when the electronic device satisfies one or more sleep conditions.

Deluca, in the Abstract, teaches a method and apparatus in a communication system operated by a service provider that controls utilization of a module added to a portable communication device including a transceiver which communicates with a fixed portion of the communication system. The portable communication device receives a request for utilization of the module. In response, the portable communication device acts to obtain a usage authorization for utilizing the module. The portable communication device disallows the utilization of the module, in response to the usage authorization being unobtainable. No part of the Deluca reference describes or suggests that the disable signal is generated when the electronic device satisfies one or more sleep conditions.

Seo fails to remedy the failure of Deluca to describe or suggest that the disable signal is generated when the electronic device satisfies one or more sleep conditions. Seo, in the Abstract and Figure 3, teaches a muting circuit in a digital audio system having a digital signal processor, a first latch, a second latch, a comparator for comparing data in the first and second latches, an address encoder, a counter, a memory, a divider, a multiplier and a switching circuit. Disturbing beat noises generated during the turning off of power to the system or null data pop noises generated in response to external influences or internal circuitry influences are muted. Seo does not describe or suggest that the disable signal is generated when the electronic device satisfies one or more sleep conditions.

Nagata fails to remedy the failure of Deluca and Seo to describe or suggest that the disable signal is generated when the electronic device satisfies one or more sleep conditions. Nagata, in the Abstract, teaches a over-sampling D/A converter which has a mute function for fixing an average DC potential of an analog output signal to a predetermined potential, and comprises a sigma delta modulator for receiving a multibit digital signal to which a DC offset value is added and then outputting a one-bit non-return-to-zero signal. Nagata does not describe or suggest that the disable signal is generated when the electronic device satisfies one or more sleep conditions. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 9 are patentable over Deluca in view of Seo and further in view of Nagata.

Claims 2-8, 21-22; and 10-11 depend from independent claims 1 and 9, respectively. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections for claims 2-8, 21-22 and 10-11 for the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 9.

Amended claim 12 describes a method of selectively muting output. The method includes the steps of: generating digital data; determining an authorization state, wherein determining the authorization state comprises comparing a mathematical function result to an expected result; generating a disable signal; transmitting the digital data to a digital to analog converter; generating an analog signal corresponding to the digital data; transmitting the disable signal to the digital to analog converter; and muting the analog signal in response to the transmitted disable signal.

Claims 12-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Deluca et al. (5,612,682) in view of Seo et al. (5,063,597) and further in view of Nagata (6,114,981). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections for at least the reason that Deluca, Seo, and Nagata do not describe or suggest that determining the authorization state comprises comparing a mathematical function result to an expected result.

No part of the Deluca, Seo, or Nagata references, as mentioned above, describes or suggests comparing a mathematical function result to an expected result to determine an authorization state. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 12 is patentable over Deluca in view of Seo and further in view of Nagata.

Claims 13-18 and 23 depend from independent claim 12. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections for claims 13-18 and 23 for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 12.

Claims 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Deluca in view of Seo in view of Nagata and further in view of Lipovski (6,675,002). However, Lipovski fails to remedy the failure of Deluca, Seo, and Nagata to describe or suggest that determining the authorization state comprises comparing a mathematical function result to an expected result. Lipovski makes no mention of a mathematical function. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection for the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 12.

In view of these remarks and amendments, Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance and the Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees and/or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 20-0668 of Texas Instruments Incorporated.

Respectfully submitted,

Indranil Chowdhury
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 47,490

Robert D. Marshall, Jr.
Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-5290